

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

	States 1 stent and 11 ademark Office
Address:	COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
	P.O. Box 1450
	Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
	www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/747,040	12/22/2000	Christoph T. Corvin	GEMS:0123/yod 15-EC-5764	4691	
7:	590 05/18/2006		EXAM	INER	
Patrick S. You	der		FELTEN, I	FELTEN, DANIEL S	
Fletcher, Yoder	& Van Someren				
P.O. Box 69228	39	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Houston, TX 77269-2289			3624		

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/747,040	CHIRSTOPH T COVIN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Daniel S. Felten	3624				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 F€	ebruary 2006.					
	action is non-final.					
•	<u>-</u>					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1-9,11-19,21-37,39-43 and 45-60</u> is/a	re pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		·				
6) Claim(s) <u>1-9, 11-19, 21-37, 39-43 and 45-60</u> is	/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) D Notice of Informal F	Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)					

Application/Control Number: 09/747,040

Art Unit: 3624

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Receipt of the amendment filed February 27, 2006 is acknowledged. Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-37, 39-43 and 45-60 are pending in the application and are presented to be examined upon their merits.

## Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's arguments filed February 27, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive
- 3. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In patent examination the examiner is charged with broadly interpretation of the claim language in light of the applicant's specification without reading limitation of the specification into the claims [see In re Hyatt]. In this case a financial analysis system, it is being interpreted as any method that performs a financial calculation to provide financial information result. Here, financial analysis system is being interpreted as the *process*. Hartley-Urquhart discloses a financing systems and method via electronic accounting and management systems (see col. 4, lines 24-33).

Application/Control Number: 09/747,040

Art Unit: 3624

A financial module or providing access to a financial module is interpreted by the examiner as being a collection of software routine(s) inherently associated with the accounting and management systems that allows the electronic transmission of financial data. The examiner disagrees that the references are devoid of "providing access" to a "financial analysis system" or 'financial module" because any thing related to the manipulation and/or management of money can also be considered within the realm of finance.

In regards to suggesting "electronic form" or "electronic fields" again the examiner disagrees. Both the purchase order and an invoice are considered forms which have various fields of information that art attached to the form(s) (e.g., buyer's name, address, items being purchased, quantity of items, etc.,). Both the purchase order and the invoice can be transmitted electronically over an electronic link (see col. 4, lines 41-62). It is submitted that when the purchase order and/or invoice are transmitted in electronically that they are in electronic form with fields being submitted in electronic form. Data is entered into the system electronically or it could not be sent via an electronic link.

Regarding trade-in data, it was submitted in the Office action dated January 07, 2005 that McCormick discloses receiving client trade data for a purchasing transaction for medical resources and that it would have been obvious for an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to integrate the teachings of McCormack into Hartley-Urquhart because an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the growing trend in medical supply chain.

Application/Control Number: 09/747,040

Art Unit: 3624

In regards to the prior art not suggesting "providing a plurality of financial transaction options that are tailored to the client" it is interpreted that each invoice and purchase order are inherently based upon customized parameters. Thus 35 USC 103(a) rejections are maintained.

## Conclusion

4. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel S. Felten whose telephone number is (571) 272-6742. The examiner can normally be reached on Flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (571) 272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 5 Application/Control Number: 09/747,040

Art Unit: 3624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Daniel S Felten Examiner Art Unit 3624

May 12, 2006

VINCENT MILLIN SUPERVISORY PATENT FORMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Vines Milli